DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 574 HE 008 335

AUTHOR Stepsus, Patricia Ann
TITLE The Development of Criteria for Nurse-Faculty Evaluation in a Collegiate Program.
PUB DATE 3 Jul 76
NOTE 57p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Bibliographies; College Faculty; Department Directors (School); *Evaluation Criteria; *Faculty Evaluation; *Higher Education; *Nurses; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance

ABSTRACT

Developed is an evaluation criteria for nurse-faculty. To determine the criteria, a questionnaire was designed and sent to 80 chairpersons/deans of nursing. A rating scale was developed for the criteria and evaluation procedures identified through the questionnaire, which was administered to 13 nurse-faculty and chairpersons of nursing. Among the twelve procedures identified in the questionnaire, nurse-faculty rated the following procedures to be most effective: chairman evaluation, student evaluation, self-evaluation, class visitation, personal conferences, colleagues' opinions, and evaluation of both classroom and clinical instruction. Among the criteria identified from the questionnaire, nurse-faculty rated the following to be most effective: teaching effectiveness, areas of strengths and weaknesses of the instructor, and visitation and observation of instructor's performance. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED130574

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA FOR NURSE-FACULTY EVALUATION IN A COLLEGIATE PROGRAM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Patricia Ann Stepsus, M.S.

Our Lady of Angels College

DR. KENNETH VARCOE
EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA CLUSTER

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

JULY 3, 1976

HE 008 335

ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to develop evaluation criteria for nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College. In order to determine the criteria to be used, a questionnaire was designed and sent to eighty chairpersons/deans of nursing. A rating scale was developed for the criteria and procedures of evaluation identified through the questionnaire and was administered to thirteen nurse-faculty and the chairperson of nursing at Our Lady of Angels College. Among the twelve procedures identified in the questionnaire, nurse-faculty rated the following procedures to be most effective: chairman evaluation, student evaluation, self-evaluation, class visitation, personal conferences, colleague's opinions and evaluation of both classroom and clinical instruction. Among the criteria identified from the questionnaire, nurse-faculty rated the following to be most effective: teaching effectiveness, areas of strengths and weaknesses of the instructor and visitation and observation of instructor's performance.

The developed questionnaire, which contains eight items, relating to the criteria and procedures for evaluation of faculty and their effectiveness at various institu-

tions of nursing is presented, as is the rating scale for criteria and procedures for evaluating nurse-faculty and tables displaying the results from the questionnaire and rating scale. Pilot testing, revision, and college-wide implementation of the criteria and procedures are recommended.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ABSTRACT		i
CHAPTER I.	INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II.	BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	4
CHAPTER III.	PROCEDURES	17
CHAPTER IV.	RESULTS	23
CHAPTER V.	DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	35
BIBLIOGRAPHY		41
APPENDIX A	LETTER TO INSTITUTION	45
APPENDIX B	QUESTIONNAIRE	46
APPENDIX C	INSTITUTIONS UTILIZED IN THE STUDY	48
APPENDIX D	RATING SCALE FOR CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION	50

LIST OF TABLES

Table

Page

1. Number of Questionnaires Returned by Chairpersons/Deans of Nursing 20
2. Responses to Items on the Questionnaire 24
3. Evaluation Procedures for Nurse-Faculty 25
4. Level of Satisfaction of Faculty Evaluation Procedures 26
5. Procedures Not Included in the Policy for Faculty Evaluation 27
6. Criteria for Faculty Evaluation 28
7. Satisfaction of Criteria for Faculty Evaluation 29
8. Criteria Not in the Procedure for Faculty Evaluation 30
9. Methods of Faculty Evaluation 31
10. Sources of Information for Faculty Evaluation 32
11. Rating of Procedures by Nurse-Faculty at Our Lady of Angels College 33
12. Criteria Rated by Nurse-Faculty at Our Lady of Angels College 34

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

With increased emphasis on accountability, a major problem for educational management is establishing criteria and a process for nurse-faculty evaluation. Evaluating the competencies of nurse-faculty has long been a difficult and complex task. A nurse-faculty member judged to be competent achieves this status as the result of how people who work with her generally feel about her.

From informal discussions with nurse-faculty and the chairperson of nursing at Our Lady of Angels College, there is a growing concern for improving the evaluation policy. What may be needed is the development of criteria and an evaluation procedure so that the nurse-faculty member can be evaluated with a higher degree of sophistication than at present.

There are some nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College who might object to the development of such criteria and procedures. Negative attitudes toward nurse-faculty evaluation, and resistance to the development of evaluative criteria may be difficult to understand. But nurse-faculty resistance to evaluation will be overcome when teachers have a significant voice in designing and carrying out

evaluation procedures.

Nurse-faculty at the College may need the opportunity to work with administrators in developing a philosophy of humanistic evaluation characterized by an emphasis on positive and constructive feedback that will promote faculty member's growth.

The purpose of this investigation is to improve the present evaluation policy by identifying criteria for nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College. Because of the clinical component in nursing, there is a need to have a more effective evaluation procedure for nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College. Currently, all faculty are evaluated by the same method.

Four methods for evaluating nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College exists: (1) observation of the instructor; (2) visitations by the chairperson and members from the evaluation committee; (3) an annual written resume shared with the chairperson of nursing; and (4) student evaluation of faculty.

In the current evaluation process for nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College, there is no formulation of valid, reliable criteria or format. Evaluation criteria that are meaningful, specific, workable, mutual and humane needs to be developed for nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College.

The investigation was conducted by use of a questionnaire to collect information in order to establish

evaluation practices for nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College (APPENDIX B).

A letter was sent to eighty institutions in the Middle Atlantic states requesting completion of the questionnaire by the chairperson/dean of nursing (APPENDIX A).

A list of criteria and procedures identified from the questionnaire was shared with nurse-faculty and the chairperson of nursing at Our Lady of Angels College. A rating of each criterion and procedure for evaluation was completed by each nurse-faculty member (APPENDIX D). An open discussion of the philosophical, theoretical, and empirical considerations that influence the evaluation of nurse-faculty followed.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The significance of this study is to meet the following goals: (1) to improve the overall quality of Our Lady of Amgels College by providing an objective means for evaluating its personnel; namely, nurse-faculty, suggesting improvements or changes: (2) to reduce the arbitariness of the decision-making processes associated with promotions and raises by making the reward structure more explicit through objective faculty evaluation; (3) to establish criteria for evaluating nurse-faculty; and (4) implementation of a new procedure for nurse-faculty evaluation.

In all types of educational endeavors, the problem of evaluation is usually ever present. Largely because of the applied nature of the profession and its clinical components, those of us in nursing education may be even more concerned with these problems.

The issues of institutional governance are coming into focus with the surge of collective bargaining, and have contributed to some professional reluctance through the American Association of University Professors who cosponsored a two-year study of the matter and developed some recommendations favoring it (Eble, 1970). Many

collective bargaining agreements today pay little or no attention to faculty evaluation.

Eble (1970) has suggested that the distribution and collection processes should consider three criteria: objectivity, coverage, and timing. About objectivity, Eble (1970:24) wrote, "In the actual administration of the questionnaires, some distance should be preserved between the faculty member whose course or courses are being evaluated and the students doing the evaluating. Filling out the questionnaire under the eyes of the faculty member who has handed them out and plans to take them up, though it may testify to a highly desirable degree of trust between the faculty member and student, may also inhibit or distort the response."

In relation to evaluation of classroom effectiveness Crawford and Bradshaw (1968) asked students to describe their most effective college teacher, and the most frequently mentioned characteristics were: thorough knowledge of subject matter, well-planned and organized lectures, student-oriented, friendly, willing to help students, and enthusiastic, energetic, lively interest in teaching.

Factors which must be considered in any evaluation process are the means and ends of the educational process as seen by the evaluator and the evaluatee, as well as the personalities of the persons involved. Most educators agree that teaching content to students is the most important factor in evaluating a teacher; however, the most

frequent source of obtaining this information is through hearsay about the instructor's ability (Gustad, 1961).

Brim and Brodie (1969:52) explained attitudes toward evaluation by referring to the personality characteristic's of the staff. "It is likely that strong opposition exists among those people who are distinctly hostile to any self-exam,instrospection, or self-understanding. These are the people who are also authoritarian in interpersonal relations, intolerant of diversity in ideology or beliefs, and strongly opposed to most forms of social change."

Burnett (1975:35) listed current approaches to teacher evaluation which should include the following: "... examination of student gain scores on standarized tests, analysis of typical student improvement, teaching performance testing, teacher skill testing, administrator or peer group observations and ratings, and student observations and ratings."

The first three approaches tend to emphasize the product diminsion of teaching, whereas, the latter three focus more on the process of teaching. Most of the research activities on teacher evaluation have concentrated on the processes and results that occur within a classroom setting.

Richardson (1972) listed three requirements of a satisfactory evaluation procedure: (1) establishment of performance objectives; (2) the degree to which objectives are achieved are based upon external evidence and instrinsic satisfaction; (3) procedures to identify levels of teacher

performance and to protect the institution against unethical or incompetent practitioners.

Gage (1961) identified three reasons for evaluating teaching: (1) The traditional need for providing a broad base for administrative decisions on promotion, salaries, and tenure; (2) The new concern for evaluation on a basis for personnel improvement and development; and (3) The need for data for further research on teaching and learning.

As stated by Miller (1974:1), "Evaluations are closely linked to three critical issues of management of higher education in the '70's - finance, governance, and accountability."

Bruner (1960) believes that teaching takes on a new meaning when teachers learn from their students. Studies done by Gagne (1963) have shown that student evaluation of teachers is, indeed, a valid method of assessing teacher effectiveness.

According to Cohen (1973) evaluating teaching professionals on the basis of specific behaviors generates other concerns. Individuality tends to be a highly valued characteristic in our society, and especially among academicians. If evaluation focuses directly on what a teacher does, then it seems reasonable to predict that teacher behaviors will tend eventually to center around whichever criterial behavior norms become established.

Walter (1975) referred to the concept of accountability, or fixing responsibility for outcomes in education.

As far back as 1912, administrators were responding enthusiastically to the idea of assessing teacher performance by objective criteria. An evaluation procedure that would assist in the teaching-learning process as well as produce some measure of a teacher's effectiveness must include a clear definition of responsibilities, specific objectives, and assessment of results by these objectives. The individual being evaluated and the evaluator(s) should agree on performance objectives, work for their accomplishment, and jointly assess the results.

In a survey of literature on student evaluation of faculty, a variety of views and approaches were found. Findings in several studies suggested that students associate certain teacher behavior with effective instruction. Ryans (1961), in his observation of 6,000 teachers, identified three distinct patterns of teacher behavior: (1) warm, understanding, friendly versus aloof, egocentric restricted teacher behavior; (2) responsible, businesslike, systematic versus evading, unplanned, slipshod teacher evaluation; and (3) stimulating, imaginative, surgent versus dull, routine teacher behavior.

In another study, Yonge and Sassenbroth (1968) identified eight major factors in effective teaching: (1) confident, fluent delivery; (2) clarity of course; (3) open, sympathetic attitude toward students; (4) interesting, stimulating; (5) fairness of evaluation; (6) suitable class material and value of course; (7) interest in and knowledge

of subject matter; and (8) preparedness of class material.

In a study of national merit scholars, Thistlethwaite (1962) found that enthusiasm was the characteristic that these students observed in the teachers whom they thought had contributed the most to their desire to learn. In another study, Solomon (1964) reported that gains in comprehension are associated positively with teacher energy and flamboyance.

Ryans (1967) identified three personality patterns or behaving styles: Pattern X-friendly, understanding, sympathetic teacher behavior; Pattern Y-responsible, businesslike, systematic teacher behavior; and Pattern Z-stimulating, imaginative teacher behavior. Lewis (1964) concluded that effective teachers cannot be differentiated from less effective ones on the basis of personality variables.

A number of studies have investigated differences in teaching evaluation made by male and female students, and differences in student ratings of male and female teachers. The studies find no significant differences in terms of the sex of the student or that of the teacher. Some evidence is to the contrary. Bendig (1952) found that female students were more unfavorable than males in their rating. McKeachie (1971) found that female teachers rated high in structure were rated more effective than their male counterparts.

Crittenden and Norr (1973) concluded from their data

that a student's perception of a teacher's effectiveness depends not only on the teacher's behavior, but also on the importance assigned to a rated characteristic by the student.

Rees (1969) factor analyzed student ratings of different teacher types and found the resulting factors to correlate significantly with rater characteristics such as socioeconomic status, class in school, and intelligence, suggesting that students' conceptions of what effective teachers do and thus their evaluations of a particular teacher are influenced by the experience background or personality of the student.

According to the literature, the most significant component of evaluating classroom teaching is the student evaluation. The evidence clearly indicates that students can evaluate teaching fairly and perceptively. Burton (1956) pointed out that students are in a better position than colleagues or administrators to judge the quality of instruction they are receiving.

Some critics of faculty evaluation contend that student ratings are directly related to grades. Substantial number of studies support the conclusion that no significant relationship exists between course grades, achievement or grade point average and student course ratings. Costin (1971:530) stated, "The positive findings that do occur might be better viewed as a partial function of the better achieving students' greater interest and motivation, rather than as a mere contamination of the validity of student

ratings."

The findings on whether or not upperclassmen or graduate students rate teachers higher than underclassmen are mixed. Miller (1972) found that seniors and graduate students rated courses higher than undergraduates. Gage (1961) found that teachers of lower-level courses were rated lower than the more advanced ones. Bendig (1952) found that upperclassmen were more unfavorable than lower classmen. Hildebrand (1971) found negligble differences in student ratings among the various grade levels.

Weaver (1960) suggested that students' ratings of their instructors are biased by grades they expect to receive in the course.

Stewart and Malpass (1966) found that the one possible limitation to the practice of students rating teachers is that those students that expect to receive high grades rate their instructors higher than those who expect low grades.

Bergquist and Phillips (1975:187-188) state "... if effectively conducted, student evaluations produce data that allow for valid comparison between teaching performance.... In other words, the student evaluation can help increase the teacher's 'accountability' in the classroom...."

A research study at the University of Kentucky, reported by Kirchner (1969), investigated student ratings when the instructor was present as compared with those when he was absent. Student ratings were statistically higher

when the instructor was in the room. It is important that this procedure be standarized for greater reliability. Costin (1971) found that students who do not sign the evaluation forms give significantly lower evaluations than those who do.

Eble (1970) suggested the following steps for the establishment and maintenance of a successful student evaluation: (1) gaining the cooperating of the faculty; (2) defining purposes, objectives, and uses; (3) arriving at means and procedures; (4) making policy decisions; (5) establishing an office for administering the program; (6) keeping the campus community informed; (7) financing a continuing program; (8) maintaining the faculty and student interest and involvement; (9) conducting follow-up activities; (10) relating evaluation to other efforts to recognize, reward, and improve teaching.

Choosing instruments for student appraisal of teaching has received little attention in the literature. Halstead (1970) has written than an adequate rating scale should contain four components: an underlying theory of instruction or a model of the instructional process; a translation of the theory or model into one or more operational definitions; development of a rating scale consistent with operational definitions; and assurance that student raters understand the criteria.

In the search for objectively quantifiable evaluation measures, and in an attempt to include student

in the evaluation process, a number of universities and colleages have devised and implemented some form of student opinion poll, survey, or instructor rating scale. McKeachie (1969) described a typical scale of this type, and recognized froms include the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire and the Purdue Rating Scale. Such forms generally require the student to rate his or her professor, the course, or a hypothetical or ideal professor on a number of dimensions (e.g., rapport, punctuality, and accessibility).

Bryant (1967) considered students too immature to evaluate effective teaching, and Fahey (1970) favored student-rating scales but raised several cautions. Research by Rodin and Rodin (1972) based on results of 293 students in a large undergraduate calculus course indicated that students are less than perfect judges of teaching effectiveness if the latter is measured by how much they have learned. They conclude that good teaching is not validly measured by student evaluations in their current form. The substantial majority of those who have written on the matter, conclude that students can evaluate fairly and perceptively.

It is clear that the nursing literature revealed little objective information concerning student evaluation of teachers.

Corwin (1965) studied extensively the conflict experienced by professionals who function within the

bureaucratic structure and its consequent dissatisfactions. Kramer and Baker (1971) suggested several methods by which satisfaction may be increased for professionals who function in complex organizations. Basically, such methods increase the autonomy of the professional and enhance her ability to function according to the standards set by the profession. Peer evaluation can be viewed as one way of increasing professional functioning. Etizoni (1964) pointed out the strong conviction among professionals that those who administer service to clients are in the best position to judge the quality of such service.

Socialization values can be identified from the characteristics which are generic to all professional groups. Wilensky (1964) defined two such characteristics: (1) service functions, based on systematic knowledge acquired through professional education, and (2) commitment to a set of norms.

Since Etzioni (1964) stated that the professional model of evaluation involves colleague judgments, peer evaluation might increase professional functioning within an organizational structure. In addition, peer evaluation policies would seem to provide a method of increasing professional autonomy. It would allow the professional to assume greater responsibility and accountability. Kramer and Baker (1971) suggested that adoption of policies which increase autonomy and functioning may also increase the professional's satisfaction within the organization and thus

decrease the exodus of professionally oriented teachers from bureaucratic settings.

A comprehensive study of the various models of college governance in the Governance Module, led to this practicum investigation. It was while investigating the form of governance at Our Lady of Angels College that the writer identified the problem for this practicum.

The governance structure at Our Lady of Angels College is a bureaucratic form of governance. According to Sikes (1974) a block to successful change is the bureaucratic processes that provide important control functions.

Some problems encountered with the bureaucratic model of evaluation, such as the lack of objective evaluation measures and the strain placed on the nurse-evaluator relationship were found to exist at Our Lady of Angels College. Inherent in the issue of peer evaluation, however, is the trend away from such a bureaucratic model to one more professional(Simms, 1973).

Self-evaluation should have a prominent place in over-all faculty and administrative evaluation. Dressel (1970) stated that self-evaluation is essential to improvement, and any kind of evaluation will be resented and rejected until an individual confronts his professional weaknesses. Eble (1970) wrote that we have probably passed the peak for institutional self-studies, and with it the peak of interest in faculty self-evaluation as a means of

improving instruction.

The literature on classroom visitation is meager. Gage (1961) contends that teaching performance during observation may depend on the teacher's nerve more than anything else. Morton (1961) believed that the visitation should be done on more than one occasion and the evaluator should be supplied with course outline and briefed in advance on course content, purposes, and procedures.

Because personal considerations do enter into faculty evaluations, criteria need to be developed.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

After an extensive review of literature was performed, on faculty evaluation, the writer sent a letter (APPENDIX A) to eighty chairpersons/deans of nursing requesting completion of the questionnaire (APPENDIX B).

The purpose of the questionnaire was to collect information from the participants regarding the procedures, policies, and criteria utilized at their institution and to determine the level of satisfaction with the current evaluation procedure and criteria for faculty evaluation.

The questionnaire consisted of a two-page, eight item, open-end and closed-end questions (APPENDIX B). The number of questions of the questionnaire were kept to a minimum, eight in number, for the purpose of arousing interest in the participant to complete the form and for the investigator to obtain sufficient data.

Four questions were open-end providing opportunity for varied responses to the evaluation procedure utilized, desired procedures not included in the present policy, criteria on which faculty evaluations are based and desired criteria which were not included in the insti-

tution's present procedure for faculty evaluation.

For two questions, the respondent was asked to check the level of satisfaction on the present procedure for faculty evaluation and the level of satisfaction on the criteria for faculty utilized at the institution.

Two questions were designed for the respondents to check those items which were appropriate to their institution regarding the method(s) of evaluation utilized and the source(s) of information for faculty evaluation.

For a broad representative sample, chairpersons/deans of nursing in public and private junior colleges, state and university schools were contacted in the following states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. The schools were accredited by Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools as identified in the 1973 Junior College Directory.

It was felt by the writer that eighty institutions would be enough to obtain adequate data concerning the collection of criteria and procedures for faculty evaluation.

Because of the limitation of time for the study to be completed, the writer did not do a check on the validity or reliability of the questionnaire, which could be a possible source of error. No procedure for estimating reliability of the questionnaire was done. It would be necessary to use a test-retest approach to reliability by breaking the questionnaire items into two parts before administering the questionnaire. Then, each half can be

separately timed and scored. Given time a reliability check would serve as a good index for the amount of error.

The main source of data collection was the questionnaire that was specifically designed for this study. Chairpersons/deans of nursing were asked to complete the questionnaire in order to collect the following information: current evaluation procedure for faculty at the institution; the level of the respondent's satisfaction with the evaluation procedure utilized; desired procedures that were not included in the present policy for faculty evaluation; pertinent criteria on which faculty evaluations were based; level of the respondent's satisfaction with the criteria for faculty evaluation used at the institution; desired criteria which were not included in the present procedure for faculty evaluation; current methods of evaluation utilized at the institution; and sources of information for faculty evaluation.

The questionnaires were mailed in May, 1976 to eighty chairpersons/deans of nursing. The institutions utilized in the study are listed (APPENDIX C).

The number of questionnaires mailed to institutions in the Middle Atlantic states is shown in Table 1. This mailing included one copy of the questionnaire (APPENDIX B) and a cover letter (APPENDIX A). The cover letter with the questionnaire gave the questionnaire some standarization and credibility. On June 15, 1976, eighteen or twenty- two per cent of the questionnaires had been returned. The highest rate was from Pennsylvania.

Table 1

Number of Questionnaires Returned By Chairpersons/Deans of Nursing

State	Questionnaires Mailed	Returned
Connecticut	7	1
Delaware	2	0
Maryland	13	4
New Jersey	13	3
New York	27	2
Pennsylvania	18	8
TOTAL	80	18

Since the questionnaires had to be mailed to the institutions, it was assumed by the writer that the various plans faculty make for the summertime, only about twenty-five to fifty per cent response rate could be anticipated within the time frame needed to collect and analyze the data.

It should be noted that this possible low return could indicate bias in the faculty group and could create a source of error in the data analysis. One thing in common was that a majority of the respondents did not return the questionnaire, sixty-two out of eighty or seventy-seven per cent.

Twelve criteria and twelve procedures for faculty evaluation were collected and analyzed from the question-

naires returned. A list of criteria and procedures for faculty evaluation were given to the chairperson of nursing and nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College. Nurse-faculty were asked to rate each criterion and procedure in terms of the degree to which each criterion and procedure would be appropriate for implementation.(APPENDIX D). The rating scale ranged from zero to seven. The numbers were to be interpreted in the following manner: zero - not applicable; one - excellent; two to three - good; four to five - fair; and six to seven - poor. There were no requirements to sign the form.

The writer has identified the following limitations in the study: (1) The sample was small due to the time element; (2) The sample consisted of more community colleges than private and state institutions; (3) All institutions of nursing do not have criteria and procedures for faculty evaluation; (4) Various items on the questionnaire were not completed by the respondents; and.(5) There was no validity/reliability check on the questionnaire.

For purposes of this investigation, the writer assumed the following: (1) All institutions of nursing have evaluation procedures and policies for faculty; (2) The chairperson/dean of nursing is knowledgeable of the faculty evaluation procedures, policies, and criteria utilized at their institution to respond to the questionnaire; (3) Evaluation procedures, policies, and criteria, methods and sources of evaluation for faculty, and level

of satisfaction for procedures and criteria for faculty evaluation are implemented at the institution; and (4) All criteria for faculty evaluation is measurable.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this study on developing criteria for nurse-faculty evaluation at Our Lady of Angels College, eighty institutions of nursing were contacted. Eighteen or twenty-two per cent of the questionnaires were returned. A summary of the data in Table 2 indicates the number of responses from institutions to each item on the questionnaire. All the respondents, eighteen or one-hundred per cent checked the level of satisfaction for their evaluation procedure. Seventeen or ninety-four per cent stated the evaluation procedure utilized at their institution. Only ten respondents or fifty-five per cent stated desired criteria not in their present procedure for faculty evaluation.

Table 2

Responses to Items on the Questionnaire

Question	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
1. Present evaluation procedure.	17	94%
2. Level of satisfaction for present procedure for faculty evaluation.	18	100%
3. Desired procedures not included in present policy for faculty evaluation.	13	72%
4. Criteria on which faculty evaluation is based.	12	66%
5. Level of satisfaction of criteria for faculty evaluation.	16	88%
6. Desired criteria not included in present procedure for faculty evaluation.	10	55%
7. Methods of evaluation utilized at the institution.	15	83%
8. Sources of information for faculty evaluation.	15	83%

Each instituion used a multiplicity of procedures for faculty evaluation. Seventeen or one-hundred per cent of the respondents used the following procedures for faculty evaluation as summarized in Table 3: student evaluation forms, class visitation, and college service. Other procedures for faculty evaluation were self-evaluation, faculty resume, and participation in college activities as indicated by fifteen respondents or eighty-eight per cent. The procedures used least eighteen per cent,

among the seventeen respondents to the question were committee review and dean evaluation (Table 3).

Table 3

Evaluation Procedures for Faculty

Procedures	N	Percentage
Student evaluation forms	17	100%
Class visitation	17	100%
College service	17	100%
Self-evaluation	15	88%
Faculty resume	15	88%
Participation in College activities	15	88%
Academic growth	12	71%
Chairman evaluation	12	71%
Peer evaluation	10	59%
Personal conferences	4	24%
Committee review	3	18%
Dean evaluation	3	18%

The present procedures for faculty evaluation at various institutions proved to be satisfactory as summarized in Table 4. Sixty-one per cent indicated that the procedures for faculty evaluation were satisfactory at their institution, while sixteen per cent were very unsatisfactory (Table 4).

Table 4

Level of Satisfaction of Faculty Evaluation Procedures

Degree of Satisfaction	N	Per Cent
Very Satisfactory	0	0
Satisfactory	11	61%
Unsatisfactory	4	23%
Very Unsatsfactory	3	16%
TOTAL	18	100%

Three out of eighteen respondents or seventeen per cent did not indicate on the questionnaire, procedures not included in their present policy for faculty evaluation. Two respondents indicated that this question was not applicable. Five out of thirteen respondents to the question stated that student evaluation of faculty was not included in the policy for faculty evaluation at their institution (Table 5). A listing of the procedures not included in the institution's policy for faculty evaluation are in Table 5.

Table 5

Procedures Not Included In The Policy For Faculty Evaluation

Procedures	Number of Institutions
Student Evaluation of Faculty	5
Peer group evaluation	2
Total faculty evaluation should not be used for nursing faculty.	1
Instructor should inform the evaluator when to observe classroom performance.	1
Written comments are not shared with faculty member by chairperson.	1
No evaluation of clinical component	1
Self-evaluation	2
TOTAL	13

Table 6 lists seven pertinent criteria as identified by fifteen out of eighteen respondents or eighty-three per cent. Three respondents did not list criteria. Teaching effectiveness and assuming responsibility for professional development were the two main criteria identified by eight institutions or fifty-three per cent. Community committment was listed as the least criterion by twenty per cent of the respondents (Table 6).

Table 6

Criteria For Faculty Evaluation

Criteria	Number of Institutions	Percentage
Assumes responsibility for professional development	8	53%
Teaching effectiveness	8	53%
College contributions	5	33%
Accepts college responsibilities	5	33%
Availability for academic advisement	6	40%
Community committment	3	20%
Personal traits - sensitivity, fairness, impartiality, and versatility	6	40%

The majority of respondents, eleven out of sixteen or sixty-nine per cent, indicated that their criteria for faculty evaluation were satisfactory. Five or thirty-one per cent stated that the criteria were very unsatisfactory. (Table 7). No reason was given for two respondents not completing this item.

Table 7

Satisfaction Of Criteria For Faculty Evaluation

Degree of Satisfaction	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Very satisfactory	0	0
Satisfactory	11	69%
Unsatisfactory	0	0
Very unsatisfactory	5	31%
TOTAL	16	100%

Table 8 lists ten criteria that were not included in the institution's procedure for faculty evaluation. Eight respondents did not complete this item. Six respondents or sixty per cent indicated that interpersonal relationships to be the main criterion not included in the procedure (Table 8). Among the criteria that were least identified by the respondents that were not in the procedure for faculty evaluation were community involvemebt, areas of strengths and weaknesses of the instructor, peer evaluation, and research., as noted by ten percent of the respondents.

Table 8

Criteria Not In Procedure For Faculty Evaluation

Criteria	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Interpersonal relationships	6	60%
Professional involvement	3	30%
Community involvement	1	10%
Areas of strengths and weaknesses of the instructor	1	10%
Peer evaluation	1	10%
Research	1	10%
Student evaluation	4	40%
Teaching effectiveness	3	30%
Visitation and observation of classroom performance	3	30%
Ranking faculty from superior to average	2	20%

For the methods of evaluation utilized for faculty, fifteen respondents indicated that the chairperson was the main method. Next was student evaluations as indicated by fourteen respondents. The least methods employed were team leader reports from other departments, administrators, and the academic dean (Table 9). Three respondents did not complete this item.

Table 9

Methods of Faculty Evaluation

Methods	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Student	14	93%
Self	6	40%
Peer	8	53%
Chairperson	15	100%
Other		
Team Leader	1	6%
Reports from other departments	1	6%
Administrators	1	6%
Academic Dean	1	6%

The chairperson/supervisor was the main source for faculty evaluation as indicated by fifteen respondents or one-hundred per cent, while student evaluation was the least source identified by two respondents or thirteen per cent (Table 10). Three respondents did not answer this question.

Table 10

Sources Of Information For Faculty Evaluation

Sources	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Chairperson/supervisor	15	100%
Dean evaluation	3	20%
Colleague's opinions	8	53%
Scholarly research and evaluation	5	33%
Committee evaluation	3	20%
Self-evaluation or report	6	40%
Other Student evaluation	2	13%

Thirteen nurse-faculty and the chairperson of nursing at Our Lady of Angels College completed the rating scale for criteria and procedures for faculty evaluation (APPENDIX D). For the twelve procedures listed, the total nurse-faculty including the chairperson of nursing agreed that dean evaluation was not applicable; student evaluation, colleague's opinions and evaluation of both classroom and clinical teaching were rated as good; and committee evaluation was considered poor on the rating scale.

The procedures given the highest rating by nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College were chairman evaluation, self-evaluation, student evaluation, class visitation,

personal conferences, colleague's opinions, and evaluation of both classroom and clinical instruction. The procedure for evaluation with the lowest response was committee evaluations (Table 11).

Table 11

Rating of Procedures By Nurse-Faculty
At Our Lady Of Angels College

Procedure	N	Rating Scale				
		Excellent 1	Good 2-3	Fair 4-5	Poor 6-7	Not Applicable
Chairman evaluation	10		X			
Dean evaluation	14					0
Self-evaluation	9		X			
Student evaluation	14		X			
Class visitation	10		X			
College service	10			X		
Faculty resume	12			X		
Committee evaluation	14				X	
Peer evaluation	10			X		
Personal conferences	10		X			
Colleague's opinions	14		X			
Evaluation of both classroom and clinical instruction	14		X			

The total nurse-faculty, fourteen members, at Our Lady of Angels College, rated the following criteria as good: teaching effectiveness, areas of strengths and weaknesses of the instructor, and visitation and observation of instructor's performance. Research and publication and ranking faculty from superior to average were rated as not applicable by fourteen nurse-faculty members (Table 12).

Table 12

Criteria Rated By Nurse-Faculty
At Our Lady of Angels College

Criteria	N	Rating Scale				
		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Applicable
Assumes responsibility for professional development	10		X			
Teaching effectiveness	14		X			
College service	10			X		
Availability for academic counseling	10			X		
Community committment	13		X			
Personal traits - sensitivity fairness, impartiality, versatility	13		X			
Interpersonal relationships	12		X			
Professional development	13		X			
Areas of strengths and weaknesses of the instructor	14		X			
Research and publication	14					0
Ranking faculty	14					0
Visitation/observation of instructor's performance	14		X			

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to identify criteria for nurse-faculty evaluation which could meet the needs and desires at Our Lady of Angels College, the writer designed a questionnaire and a rating scale for evaluation criteria and procedures.

The numerical data, for returns of the questionnaire, were shown in Table 1. There were eighteen respondents or twenty-two per cent returned. The results indicated that one-hundred per cent of the seventeen respondents used the following procedures for faculty evaluation: student evaluation forms, class visitation, and college service (Table 3). According to the results of the rating scale for criteria and procedures for evaluation, the total nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College identified the following procedures to be effective for possible implementation: chairman evaluation, self-evaluation, student evaluation, class visitation, personal conferences, colleague's opinions and evaluation of both classroom and clinical performance (Table 11).

The results from the questionnaire and the

rating scale for criteria and procedures for evaluation indicated that the two main procedures for evaluation utilized by the institutions of nursing were student evaluations and class visitations. College service was rated by ten nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College to be fair as compared to one-hundred per cent of the respondents utilizing this procedure.

The two main criteria for faculty evaluation identified by eight respondents or fifty-three per cent, were teaching effectiveness and assuming responsibility for professional development, while the total nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College rated teaching effectiveness, areas of strengths and weaknesses of the instructor, and visitation and observation of the instructor's performance to be the main criteria for evaluation of faculty (Table 12). The results from the questionnaire and the rating scale for criteria and procedures for evaluation indicated that teaching effectiveness was the main criterion for faculty evaluation.

There were similarities between the institution's responses and responses by nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College in the methods of evaluation used. The results of the questionnaire indicated that fifteen respondents or one-hundred per cent used the chairman as the main method for faculty evaluation. Student evaluation was the second main method of faculty evaluation utilized by fifteen respondents or ninety-three

per cent (Table 9). According to the results of the rating scale for criteria and procedures for evaluation, the total nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College rated student evaluation to be the main method for faculty evaluation, while chairman evaluation was rated second in importance by ten nurse-faculty members (Table 11).

The writer assumed that all criteria for faculty evaluation utilized by various institutions would be measurable. From the responses from the questionnaire, the writer identified the following criteria not to be measurable: interpersonal relationships and personal traits. Personal traits such as sensitivity, fairness, impartiality, and versatility were included by six respondents or forty per cent, as criteria for faculty evaluation (Table 6). Six respondents or sixty per cent indicated interpersonal relationships to be the criterion not included in the procedure for faculty evaluation (Table 8). Nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College rated the criteria personal traits and interpersonal relationships as good (Table 12).

The findings of this study indicated that the majority of institutions, sixty one per cent indicated that the present procedures for faculty evaluation were satisfactory, while sixteen per cent of the respondents stated that the procedures were very unsatisfactory (Table 4).

There was a higher percentage of very unsatis-

factory criteria for faculty evaluation indicated by thirty-one per cent of the respondents than for the procedures for faculty evaluation, as indicated by sixteen per cent of the respondents.

Results from the questionnaire relating to the sources of information for faculty evaluation revealed fifteen respondents or one-hundred per cent indicating the chairperson/supervisor to be the main source. At Our Lady of Angels College, ten nurse-faculty members rated chairman evaluation as good (Table 11). Chairman evaluation was the main source identified by respondents to the questionnaire and nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College.

From the results of this study, the writer identified the following implications: first, results from the questionnaire gave criteria and procedures for evaluation of nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College; secondly, nurse-faculty and the chairperson of nursing were able to rate the criteria and procedures for faculty evaluation derived from the questionnaire; thirdly, criteria and procedures for faculty evaluation may be implemented at Our Lady of Angels College after administration and student's approval.

The data was collected and analyzed and the findings were used to make recommendations in the establishment of evaluation criteria for nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College.

The difficulties involved in effectively evaluating nurse-faculty seems to be legion. Any attempt to do so at Our Lady of Angels College must have the cooperation of administration. The identification of criteria for nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College is a first step on an arduous road to interaction among nurse-faculty, students, and administrators for perfecting such criteria. Students, faculty, and administrators should have input into the evaluation form to be developed since all concerned would be involved in the evaluation process. It is hoped that criteria for nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College will be approved by administration. It should be constantly be revised and updated to more accurately reflect the concerns at Our Lady of Angels College and to better identify those nurse-faculty members who are in need of instructional improvement. To these ends, the following recommendations are made.

First, the criteria for nurse-faculty evaluation should be incorporated into an evaluation form used on a trial basis at Our Lady of Angels College, Fall semester, 1976. This would enable the nurse-faculty to determine such factors as time taken to administer the evaluation, feasibility of obtaining and interpreting results, and distribution of the results. It is suggested that nurse-faculty be invited to participate in a revision session at the conclusion of the Fall semester in order to help amend any portion of the instrument which needs it. Their

suggestions and comments should be solicited.

Secondly, a revision committee should be formed. This committe should be composed of administrators, faculty, and students. Their concern would be to revise and reform the criteria and procedures for evaluation to further reflect the concerns suggested by the Fall session trial period and the session which followed. They should also devise an objective scoring system in order to set norms to base suggestions for improvement of faculty performance.

Thirdly, the chairperson of nursing may suggest and offer assistance to nurse-faculty regarding self-improvement. This aid could come in the form of seminars or workshops.

Fourth, the criteria for nurse-faculty evaluation may be officially recognized and approved by both faculty and administration, Spring, 1977.

Teaching has been identified by administrators and faculty as the most important function of an instructor at Our Lady of Angels College. There should be some method of discovering whether or not it is effectively being done. If we are to remain a viable, effective, teaching institution, we must effect change which will effect a more cohesive nurse- faculty, student body, and administration, dedicated to quality instruction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albrecht, S. 1972. Reappraisal of Conventional Performance Appraisal. Journal of Nursing Administration. 11:29-35.

Bendig, A.W. 1952. The Use of Student-Rating Scales in the Evaluation of Instructors in Introductory Psychology. Journal of Educational Psychology. 43: 167-175.

Bergquist, W.H. and Philips, S.R. 1975. Components of an Effective Faculty Development Program. Journal of Higher Education. 46: 187-188.

Brim and Brodie. 1969. Educational Evaluation: New Roles, New Means. The 68th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part II. P. 52. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bruner, J.S. 1960. The Process of Education. P. 190. New York: Vintage Books.

Burnett, J.D. 1975. Evaluating Teachers. Research and Information Report. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education. June. P. 35. Toronto, Canada.

Burton, C.E. 1956. College Teaching. Pp. 35-40. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Bryant, P.T. 1967. By Their Fruits Ye Shall Know Them. Journal of Higher Education. 38: 328-330.

Cohen, A.M. Trent, J.W., and Rose, C. 1973. Evaluation of Teaching, in Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Edited by R.M.W. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Corwin, R. 1965. The Professional Employee: A Study of Conflict in Nursing Roles, in Social Interaction and Patient Care. Pp. 341-356. Edited by James K. Skipper, Jr. and Robert C. Leonard. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company.

Costin, F. 1971. Student Ratings of College Teaching: Reliability, Validity, and Usefulness. Review of Educational Research. 41: 511-535.

Crawford, P.L. and Bradshaw, H.L. 1968. Perception of Characteristics of Effective University Teachers: A Scaling Analysis. Educational and Psychological Measurement. 28: 1079-1085.

Crittenden, K.S. and Norr, J.L. 1973. Student Values and Teacher Evaluation: A Problem in Person Perception. Sociometry. 36. 2: 143-151.

Dressel, P.L. 1970. Evaluation of the Environment, the Process, and the Results of Higher Education, in Handbook of College and University Administration: Academic. Edited by A.S. Knowles. New York: McGraw-Hill Company.

Eble, K.E. 1970. Project to Improve College Teaching. Academe. 4: 3-6.

_____. 1972. Professors as Teachers. P. 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Etzioni, A. 1964. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Fahey, G.L. 1970. Student Rating of Teaching: Some Questionable Assumptions, in Student Evaluation of Teaching. Edited by Alex J. Ducans. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Institute for Higher Education, University of Pittsburgh.

Gage, N.L. 1961. The Appraisal of College Teaching. Journal of Higher Education. 32: 17-22.

_____. 1963. Handbook of Research on Teaching. P. 367. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Gustad, J.W. 1961. Policies and Practices in Faculty Evaluation. Educational Research. 42: 194-211.

Halstead, J.S. 1970. A Model for Research on Ratings of Courses and Instructors. Proceedings of the 78th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association. 5: 625-626.

Hildebrand. 1971. Evaluating University Teaching. Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

Kirchner, R.P. 1969. "A Control Factor in Teacher Evaluation by Students." P. 7. Unpublished research paper. University of Kentucky.

Kramer, M. and Baker, C. 1971. The Exodus: Can We Prevent It? Journal of Nursing Administration. 1: 15-30.

Lewis, E.C. 1964. An Investigation of Student-Teacher Interaction as a Determiner of Effective Teaching. Journal of Educational Research. 57: 36-40..

Miller, R.I. 1972. Evaluating Faculty Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

_____. 1974. Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. P. 1. Washington: Jossey-Bass.

McKeachie, W.J. 1969. Student Rating of Faculty. American Association of University Professors Bulletin. 55: 43-444.

_____. 1971. Student ratings of Teacher Effectiveness: Validity Studies. American Educational Research Journal. 8: 435-445.

Morton, R.K. 1961. Evaluating College Teaching. Improving College and University Teaching. 9: 122-123.

Rees, R.D. 1969. Dimensions of Students' Points of View in Rating College Teachers. Journal of Educational Psychology. 60. 6: 476-484.

Richardson, R. 1972. Governance for the Two-Year College. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated.

Rodin, M. and Rodin, B. 1972. Student Evaluations of Teachers. Science Magazine. 177: 1164-1166.

Ryans, D.G. 1961. Some Relations Between Pupil Behavior and Certain Teacher Characteristics. Journal of Educational Psychology. 52: 82-90.

_____. 1967. Teacher Behavior Can Be Evaluated. In The Evaluation of Teaching. Washington, D.C.: Pi Lamda Theta.

Sikes, W. 1974. Renewing Higher Education. P. 43. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Simms, L.L. 1973. Administrative Changes and Implications for Nursing Practice in the Hospital. Nursing Clinics of North America. 8: 227-234.

Solomon, D. 1964. Teacher Behavior and Student Learning. Journal of Educational Psychology. 55: 23-30.

Stewart, C.T. and Malpass, L.F. 1966. Estimates of Achievement and Ratings of Instructors. Journal of Educational Research. 59: 347-350.

Thistlethwaite, D.L. 1962. Rival Hypotheses for Explaining the Effects of Different Learning Environments. Journal of Educational Psychology. 53: 310-315.

Walter, F.B. 1975. "Mandates for Evaluation: The National Overview." Paper presented at the conference of the Kentucky Association of Teacher Educators, October 31, Breckenridge, Kentucky.

Weaver, C.H. 1960. Instructor Rating by College Students. Journal of Educational Psychology. 51: 21-25.

Wilensky, H. 1964. The Professionalization of Everyone? American Journal of Sociology. 70: 137-158.

Yonge, G.D. and Sassenrath, J.M. 1968. Student Personality Correlates of Teacher Ratings. Journal of Educational Psychology. 59: 44-52.

OUR LADY OF ANGELS COLLEGE
ASTON, PENNSYLVANIA 19014

(215) GL 9-0903

APPENDIX A

May 17, 1976

Dear Colleague:

I would like your assistance in identifying the evaluation process utilized for nurse-faculty.

The purpose of this study is to collect information on the evaluation process for nurse-faculty in programs of nursing and to develop criteria for evaluation based on this information. In addition to its prime purpose, the study will partially fulfill requirements for a doctoral program at Nova University.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire which deals with the procedures of evaluation for nurse-faculty at your institution, criteria for evaluation, methods of evaluation utilized, and sources of information used in the evaluation process.

It would be most appreciated if this questionnaire could be returned by June 5, 1976.

Please forward the questionnaire to my home address:

Ms. Patricia Ann Stepsus
657 Beatty Road
Springfield, Pennsylvania 19064

Thank you for your cooperation in this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Patricia Ann Stepsus

Patricia Ann Stepsus
Assistant Professor

APPENDIX B

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA FOR NURSE-FACULTY EVALUATION IN A COLLEGIATE PROGRAM

Name of Institution _____

Please answer each question carefully. Provide a check (x) in the appropriate areas and a written response when indicated.

1. State the evaluation procedure for faculty at your institution. A xerox copy of the procedure may be submitted.

2. Check (x) one of the following responses. Do you perceive the present procedure for faculty evaluation at your institution to be

Very Satisfactory Satisfactory Unsatisfactory Very Unsatisfactory

3. State the desired procedures which are not included in your present policy for faculty evaluation.

4. List pertinent criteria on which your faculty evaluation is based.

5. Check (x) one of the following responses. Do you perceive the criteria for faculty evaluation at your institution to be

Very Satisfactory Satisfactory Unsatisfactory Very Unsatisfactory

6. State desired criteria which are not included in your present procedure for faculty evaluation.

7. In evaluating your faculty, check (x) the method(s) of evaluation utilized at your institution.

_____ a. Student
_____ b. Self
_____ c. Peer
_____ d. Chairperson or acting supervisor
_____ e. Other

8. In your evaluation process, check (x) the source(s) of information for faculty evaluation.

_____ a. Chairperson/Supervisor evaluation
_____ b. Dean evaluation
_____ c. Colleagues' opinions
_____ d. Scholarly research and evaluation
_____ e. Committee evaluation
_____ f. self-evaluation or report
_____ g. Other

APPENDIX C

INSTITUTIONS OF NURSING UTILIZED IN THE STUDY

States	Returned
CONNECTICUT	
1. Mattatuck Community College	
2. Norwalk Community College	X
3. Quinnipiac Community College	
4. University of Bridgeport	
5. University of Connecticut	
6. Western Connecticut State College	
7. Yale University	
DELAWARE	
1. Delaware Technical Community College	
2. Wesley College	
MARYLAND	
1. Allegheny Community College	
2. Anne Arundol	X
3. Catonsville Community College	
4. Community College of Baltimore	
5. Columbia Union College	
6. Essex Community College	
7. Frederick Community College	X
8. Hagerstown Community College	
9. Harford Community College	
10. Howard Community College	
11. Montgomery County Community College	X
12. Prince George Community College	X
13. Towson State College	
NEW JERSEY	
1. Atlantic City Community College	
2. Bergen Community College	X
3. Brookdale Community College	
4. Community College of Mo rris	
5. Cumberland Community College	
6. Essex Community College	
7. Gloucester Community College	
8. Mercer County Community College	X
9. Middlesex Community College	X
10. Ocean County Community College	
11. Passaic County Community College	

States	Returned
12. Rutgers University	
13. Seton Hall University	
14. Somerset Community College	
NEW YORK	
1.Adelphia University	
2.Alfred University	
3.Broome Community College	
4.Corning Community College	
5. Dutchess Community College	
6. Erie Community College	
7. Fukton-Montgomery Community College	
8. Genesee College	
9. D'Youville College	
10. Hartwick College	
11. Hudson Valley Community College	
12. Jamestown Community College	
13. Jefferson Community College	
14. Kluka College	
15. Long Island University System	
16. Mohawk Valley Community College	
17. Molloy College	
18. Nassau Community College	X
19. Niagara Community College	
20. Niagara University	
21. Onondaga Community College	
22. Orange County Community College	
23. Roberts Weslyan College	
24. Russell Sage College	
25. Skidmore College	
26. Suffolk County Community College	X
27. Ulster County Community College	
PENNSYLVANIA	
1. Bucks County Community College	X
2. Butler County Community College	X
3. Carlow College	
4. Community College of Beaver County	
5. Community College of Philadelphia	X
6. Delaware County Community College	
7. College Misericordia	
8. Duquesne University	
9. Harrisburg Area Community College	X
10. Gwynedd-Mercy Junior College	X
11. Luzerne County Community College	X
12.Montgomery County Community College	X
13.Northampton County Community College	
14. Villanova University	
15. Westmoreland County Community College ..	y
16. West Chester State College	
17. Widener College	
18. Wilkes College	

APPENDIX D

RATING SCALE FOR CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

June 15, 1976

Dear Colleague,

The purpose of this rating scale is to develop criteria for nurse-faculty evaluation at Our Lady of Angels College. In addition to its prime purpose, the study will partially fulfill requirements for a doctoral program at Nova University.

The criteria and procedures for evaluation listed have been collected from questionnaires that were sent to eighty potential chairpersons/deans of nursing in the regional area.

Thank you for your cooperation in this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Stepsus

Patricia A. Stepsus

Rate the criteria and procedures in terms of the degree to which they would be feasible for implementation for nurse-faculty at Our Lady of Angels College. Place in the appropriate space the number that most nearly expresses your view.

CRITERIA	RATING				
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Applicable
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	0
Assumes responsibility for professional development	—	—	—	—	—
Teaching effectiveness	—	—	—	—	—
College service	—	—	—	—	—
Availability for academic counseling	—	—	—	—	—

CRITERIA	RATING Excellent 1	Good 2-3	Fair 4-5	Poor 6-7	Not Applicable 0
Community committment	—	—	—	—	—
Personal traits - i.e., sensitivity, fairness, etc.	—	—	—	—	—
Interpersonal relationships	—	—	—	—	—
Professional development	—	—	—	—	—
Areas of strengths and weaknesses of the instructor	—	—	—	—	—
Research and publication	—	—	—	—	—
Ranking faculty from superior to average	—	—	—	—	—
Visitation and observation of instructor's performance	—	—	—	—	—
PROCEDURES					
Chairman evaluation	—	—	—	—	—
Dean evaluation	—	—	—	—	—
Self-evaluation	—	—	—	—	—
Student evaluation	—	—	—	—	—
Class visitation	—	—	—	—	—
College service	—	—	—	—	—
Faculty resume	—	—	—	—	—
Committee evaluations	—	—	—	—	—
Peer evaluation	—	—	—	—	—
Personal conferences	—	—	—	—	—
Colleague's opinions	—	—	—	—	—
Evaluation of both classroom and clinical instruction	—	—	—	—	—